

Atty. Dkt. No. K00-001C01
(formerly 0001.US01.CIP)

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Claims 1 and 7 are currently being amended.

This amendment adds, changes and/or deletes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-12 are now pending in this application.

Claim Objections

Claims 1 and 7 were objected to for minor informalities. Applicant has amended claims 1 and 7 to more clearly recite the invention. Accordingly, the objection should now be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the article by David King (hereinafter "King") in view of U.S. Patent Application Publications 2002/0002586 A1 to Rafal et al. (hereinafter "Rafal"). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections for at least the following reasons.

The present invention relates to systems and methods for on-line, interactive fundraising. Embodiments of the invention encourage potential donors to give charitable contributions by

Atty. Dkt. No. K00-001C01
(formerly 0001.US01.CIP)

providing recognition of donors. In this regard, a donor-driven virtual plaque may be displayed on one or more web pages. Thus, a donor may specify the content of at least a portion of the virtual plaque. For example, as described in the specification, “[a] donor may choose the specific words and language inscribed in the virtual plaque and is further able to modify the virtual plaque at a later time.” Specification, Paragraph [0038]. Accordingly, independent claims 1 and 7 each recite “updating, according to instructions from a donor, the one or more virtual plaques”

The Office Action cites King as disclosing a virtual plaque. Applicant notes that the publication date on the King article is noted as “Fall 2000”, while the Examiner has handwritten the date, “August 10, 2000.” It is unclear how the Examiner obtained this date. Further, Applicant has submitted herewith an affidavit from inventors Dr. Harry Gruber and Dr. Allen Gruber, along with documentation exhibiting conception of the invention prior to the August 10, 2000, date of the King reference. Accordingly, King should be withdrawn as a prior art reference.

Rafal fails to teach or suggest “updating, according to instructions from a donor, one or more virtual plaques.” Rafal relates to a method for creating and hosting online parties. Rafal does not relate to, and therefore does not address problems associated with, fundraising activity. Nowhere does Rafal teach or suggest anything similar to virtual plaques. The Office Action cites Rafal for the teaching of updating certain information in a database. For example, paragraph [0012] of Rafal discloses that the “data warehouse ... constantly updates the profiles of hosts, guests of honor, and gift-givers.” The updating of information in a database cannot be equated to updating a virtual plaque displayed on a website to honor a donor. Accordingly, Rafal fails to teach or suggest each feature of the claimed invention.

Thus, independent claims 1 and 7 are patentable for at least the foregoing reasons.

Claims 2-6 and 8-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over King in view of U.S. Patent 6,009,410 to LeMole et al. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Atty. Dkt. No. K00-001C01
(formerly 0001.US01.CIP)

Claims 2-6 depend, either directly or indirectly, from allowable claim 1 and are, therefore, patentable for at least that reason, as well as for additional patentable features when those claims are considered as a whole. Similarly, claims 8-12 depend, either directly or indirectly, from allowable claim 7 and are, therefore, patentable for at least that reason.

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 50-1674. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 50-1674. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1674.

Respectfully submitted,

Date January 6, 2006

By Sanjeev K. Dhand

KINTERA, INC.
Customer Number: 27309
Telephone: (858) 795-8915
Facsimile: (858) 795-3010

Sanjeev K. Dhand
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 51,182